EXHIBIT A

(Case called) 1 THE COURT: First order of business, I will ask the 2 3 clerk to swear the interpreter. (Interpreter sworn) 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 6 Mr. Naftalis, why don't you bring me up to date on 7 your understanding of today's proceeding. 8 MR. NAFTALIS: Your Honor, my understanding of today's 9 proceeding is that the defendant intends to plead guilty to a superseding information, S2 10 CR 131, pursuant to a plea 10 agreement dated June 13 of 2012. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Shroff, I take it 13 you're in concurrence? 14 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, that is my client's 15 application to the Court. 16 THE COURT: All right. I should advise counsel that I 17 have in my hand a 60-page draft of the decision on the motion 18 to suppress, which of course will now be suppressed. It was 19 ready to go earlier this week when I received a call from 20 counsel and I refrained from filing it. 21 So that's where we are. I advise you of that and I take it, Ms. Shroff, it is still your decision that you and 22 23 your client wish to go forward with the plea proceeding. Is that correct? 24

May I?

MS. SHROFF:

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. 1 MS. SHROFF: 2 Okay. (Defendant and counsel conferring) 3 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, it would be nice to know if 4 5 we prevailed, but I've confirmed with my client and inform the Court that he wishes to proceed with his quilty plea. 6 7 Okay. Well, you can all proceed from here THE COURT: 8 on with your best thoughts as to what the outcome would have 9 been. I say that to both sides. 10 Mr. Ahmed, before I accept a quilty plea from you I must satisfy myself that you understand the rights you would 11 12 have if you went to trial and the rights you're giving up by pleading quilty. Also I must satisfy myself that there's a 13 14 factual basis for a plea of quilty and that you understand the 15 consequences of pleading guilty. 16 So in a moment I'm going to have the clerk place you under oath. 17 I'm going to ask you certain questions. I'm going to inform you of certain rights. 18 19 If I ask you something or I tell you something and you 20 don't quite understand, please tell me. I'll put it into different words. 21 22

Also, if at any time this afternoon you wish to speak in private with Ms. Shroff, please let me know that and I will give you the opportunity to do that.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: 1 Yes. THE COURT: All right. Please stand and the clerk 2 3 will administer the oath. (Defendant sworn) 4 All right. Mr. Ahmed, please be seated. 5 THE COURT: You're now under oath and your answers to my questions 6 7 are subject to the penalties of perjury or of making a false 8 statement if you do not answer truthfully. Also, anything you 9 say today may be used in a prosecution for those crimes. Do you understand that, sir? 10 THE DEFENDANT: 11 Yes. 12 THE COURT: How old are you, Mr. Ahmed? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Thirty-eight. 14 All right. How far did you go in school? THE COURT: 15 THE DEFENDANT: I haven't finished high school. 16 THE COURT: All right. Are you now or have you 17 recently been under the care of a medical doctor? 18 THE DEFENDANT: No. Do you have any physical complaints, any 19 THE COURT: 20 medical problems at present? 21 THE DEFENDANT: No. But since I had my hernia operation, I feel that the area that they made the operation in 22 23 is numb. All right. How do you feel today? 24 THE COURT: 25 THE DEFENDANT: Fine.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Have you ever been treated for a mental illness?

> THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Shroff, any doubts as to defendant's competence to plead?

MS. SHROFF: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same question for Mr. Naftalis.

MR. NAFTALIS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Based upon my observations of Mr. Ahmed and his responses to my questions, I find that he is fully competent to enter an informed plea.

Mr. Ahmed, have you in fact discussed the charges against you with your lawyer, Ms. Shroff?

THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: Have you had enough time to consider all of your options in this case?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with your lawyer's representation of you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now I have in front of me a piece of paper which is titled the Waiver of Indictment, and I will have the clerk place it in front of Mr. Ahmed.

Mr. Ahmed, did you in fact sign that waiver of 1 2 indictment? 3 THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: Did you understand that you had the right 4 to have evidence underlying the charges presented to a grand 5 jury of 23 people and to have those people decide by a majority б 7 vote whether you should be charged or not and that by signing 8 the waiver of indictment, you gave up that right and permitted 9 the government to file the charges based only on the signature 10 of the United States Attorney; do you understand that? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Did you read and understand the waiver 13 before you signed it? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Ms. Shroff before 16 you signed it? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Right before you came in, your 18 Honor. 19 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may I just have a second? 20 THE COURT: You may. 21 (Defendant and counsel conferring) 22 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, Mr. Ahmed just wants to make 23 one slight correction. 24 THE COURT: You may proceed. Your Honor, this piece of paper was 25 THE DEFENDANT:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

read by my attorney and the translator translated, but I didn't 1 read it myself.

THE COURT: All right. But the translator translated the content of the paper to you?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. And you understand you were giving up the right to have this grand jury, this body of 23 people, decide whether or not you should be charged?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I find that the waiver of indictment is knowing and voluntary and it is accepted.

Well, first of all, I will deem the superseding information to be filed in open court.

Ms. Shroff, have you and your client received, read, and reviewed the superseding information bearing the docket No. S2 10 CR 131?

I have read it, your Honor, and it was MS. SHROFF: read to him through the Arabic interpreter who's translating today.

Is there an application to waive the THE COURT: public reading thereof?

MS. SHROFF: There is, your Honor. There is an application to waive the public reading and, with the Court's permission, for Mr. Ahmed to enter a guilty plea to it.

THE COURT: All right. I will take the latter point

under advisement, but the public reading is waived.

Mr. Ahmed, I'm now going to explain you to certain rights you would have if the case went to trial and rights you would be giving up by pleading quilty.

Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you are entitled to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury on the charges contained in the information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would not have to prove that you were innocent. The government would be required to prove each element of each crime by proof beyond a reasonable doubt. You would be presumed to be innocent. If there were a trial, before you could be found guilty, a jury of 12 people would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, at every stage of your case you'd be entitled to be represented by a lawyer, and, if you could not afford a lawyer, one would be appointed at public expense.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, the witnesses for the government would have to come to court to testify. You

C6DLAHMP

Plea

would be able to see and hear them, confront them. Your lawyer would have a right to question them through cross-examination. Your lawyer would be able to object to evidence offered by the government. Your lawyer would be able to present evidence and could ask the court to compel witnesses to appear at trial on your behalf.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to testify if you chose to do so. You could come up here and take the witness stand. Also, you would have the right not to testify and no one would be permitted to draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from the fact that you decided not to testify.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If there were a trial and the jury found you guilty, you would have the right to appeal that finding.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, those are the rights you would have if you went to trial. If I accept the plea of guilty from you, there will be no trial. You will proceed to the sentencing phase in which I will decide on the punishment to be imposed on you.

1	Do you understand all that?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Even now you have the right to change your
4	mind. Instead of pleading guilty, you may plead not guilty and
5	go to trial.
6	Do you wish to plead not guilty and go to trial?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.
8 .	THE COURT: No, the question is not whether you
9	understand, but whether you wish to plead not guilty and go to
10	trial in this case. If you would like to do that, you may do
11	that.
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I will plead, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir, I didn't hear your answer.
14	Yes I didn't hear what else you said, sir.
15	THE INTERPRETER: Plead.
16	THE COURT: The question you're being asked is: Do
17	you wish to plead not guilty and have a trial in this case?
18	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. I will plead guilty.
19	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ahmed, do you understand
20	that in Count One of the information you are charged with
21	conspiracy to provide material support to a foreign terrorist
22	organization, namely, Alshabaab?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Do you understand that Count One carries a

 ${\tt maximum}$ term of five years' imprisonment, a ${\tt maximum}$ term of

C6DLAHMP

1.6

supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, twice the gross pecuniary or monetary gain derived from the offense or twice gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself resulting from the offense, and a \$100 mandatory special assessment; do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Two charges you with conspiracy to receive military-type training from a foreign terrorist organization, namely, Alshabaab; do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Two carries a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself resulting from the offense, and a \$100 mandatory special assessment; do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the total maximum term of imprisonment on Counts One and Two is ten years' imprisonment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, with regard to supervised release, there are terms and conditions attached to it and if

25

repeat that?

you do not live up to those terms and conditions, you can be 1 2 returned to prison for the full period of supervised release. 3 So say, for example, you receive a prison term 4 followed by a period of three years' supervised release and you 5 live up to the terms of supervised release for two years but 6 then you violate one of the terms, you can be returned to 7 prison for a full period of three years. 8 Do you understand that? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 10 Mr. Ahmed, are you a U.S. citizen? THE COURT: 11 THE DEFENDANT: 12 THE COURT: One of the consequences of pleading guilty 13 is that you will likely be deported and barred from reentry 14 into this country. 15 Do you understand that, sir? 16 THE DEFENDANT: 17 THE COURT: Did you discuss that circumstance with Ms. Shroff? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: All right. The Court must require that 21 you make financial restitution to any person who I find was 22 injured by reason of your crimes. 23 Do you understand that?

Is it possible for you, your Honor, to

THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: Yes. Financial restitution means making someone who was injured by your criminal conduct financially whole, compensating them. Now, if it turns out that I find someone was injured by reason of your conduct, I'm required to make that person whole by imposing a restitution obligation on you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Shroff, is it your client's intention to admit the forfeiture allegations in paragraphs 7 through 12 of the information today?

MS. SHROFF: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I take it Mr. Ahmed is not serving any other sentence, state or federal, or being prosecuted in state court for any crime, is that correct, Ms. Shroff?

MS. SHROFF: He's not being prosecuted nor is he serving time for any other crime.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Ahmed, in sentencing you I will receive a presentence report prepared by the office of probation which gives me background information and a recommended range of sentence under the sentencing guidelines.

After hearing from your lawyer and from the government, I will have my own obligation to determine the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

correct guideline range in this case. Even after determining the proper guideline range, I need not follow it and can sentence you all the way up to the statutory maximum. The guidelines are advisory and they're not binding on the Court. They are one of the factors that are considered under the sentencing statute which is known as Section 3553(a).

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I understand that you have entered into a plea agreement with the government.

Is that correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Let me show you an eight-page document addressed to Sabrina Shroff and Sean Maher dated

June 13 on Department of Justice letterhead, and I will ask you whether that is your plea agreement with the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or forced you in any way to enter into the plea agreement or to plead guilty in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Is that your signature on the last page of the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: Did you have the plea agreement translated

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into the Arabic language for you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. He translated for me.

THE COURT: All right. Did you discuss the plea agreement with your lawyer, Ms. Shroff?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you understand the plea agreement before you signed it?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Shroff, could you briefly review with me the process of review with your client?

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, the review of the plea agreement?

THE COURT:

MS. SHROFF: I visited with Mr. Ahmed at the MCC, and I visited along with and without the interpreter several times between June 14 and today. I visited with Mr. Ahmed this morning along with the Arabic interpreter. We did not have a word-for-word written translation of the document, but Mr. --I'm sorry, I don't know Fouad's last name.

> THE COURT: The interpreter.

MS. SHROFF: Right. He translated each paragraph as I reviewed it with my client, and I ensured that Mr. Ahmed understood each paragraph of the plea agreement.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Shroff.

Mr. Ahmed, does this plea agreement contain all of

your understandings with the government? 1 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I meant -- I 2 apologize. I meant that I reviewed it on -- I reviewed it 3 yesterday, which was June 12, and then I reviewed it the day 4 5 before, which was June 11. Today is the 13th. THE COURT: We haven't gotten up to the 14th yet. 6 7 MS. SHROFF: So that's when I got the plea agreement 8 and --9 THE COURT: Was on the 12th. 10 MS. SHROFF: -- I think we got it late 11th and I reviewed it with him on the 11th and the 12th. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 Thank you. Mr. Ahmed, does the plea agreement contain all of your 13 14 understandings with the government? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises or given you 17 any inducements to enter into the plea agreement or to plead 18 quilty? THE DEFENDANT: Other than what exists in this plea 19 20 agreement, the ten years and all of that, nothing else. 21 THE COURT: All right. Nothing that's not set forth in the agreement has been promised to you; is that what you're 22 23 telling me? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I want you to know, Mr. Ahmed, that

C6DLAHMP

Plea

any prediction, calculation or estimate that anyone has made to you as to what sentence I might give you is not binding on the Court and if it turns out to be wrong, you will not be permitted to withdraw your guilty plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, one of the features of your agreement with the government is that you and the government have agreed on a guideline range that applies in your case and, indeed, that guideline range is actually not a range but a single number of 120 months' imprisonment.

Is that correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, that agreement as to the stipulated guideline sentence is binding on you and it's binding on the government, but it's not binding on the Court. I have my own obligation to determine the correct guideline sentence. It cannot exceed 120 months in this case, and the guideline range is one of the factors in determining the sentence.

One of the features of your plea agreement with the government is that if I should sentence you to the 120 months, the government has agreed not to appeal. But you have also agreed that if I sentence you to the 120 months or less than 120 months, you agree that you will not appeal or collaterally attack that sentence. You have waived your right to appeal or

C6DLAHMP collaterally attack a sentence unless the sentence is above the 1 120 months. 2 3 Do you understand that, sir? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 5 THE COURT: And, as I've said, I cannot lawfully give you a sentence in excess of 120 months' imprisonment. 6 7 course, I can impose fine, supervised release and the mandatory 8 assessment, the forfeiture and the restitution. 9 Do you understand all that? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 11 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Naftalis, what are the 12 elements of the crime? In other words, what would the government have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt and what in 13 14 summary would be the government's evidence on Counts One and 15 Two were this case to go to trial? 16 MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor. 17 With respect to superseding information S2 10 CR 131, Count One charges a violation of 18 U.S.C. 371, namely, that 18 19 the defendant conspired to provide material support to a 2.0 designated foreign terrorist organization, here, Alshabaab. 21 The elements that the government would prove beyond a

reasonable doubt at trial would be:

22

23

24

25

First, that the defendant entered into an agreement to provide material support or resources with at least one other person.

1.6

Second, that the support or resources that were to be provided were destined for a designated foreign terrorist organization, here, Alshabaab.

Third, that the defendant knew one of three things about Alshabaab: either that it was designated by the Secretary of State of the U.S. as a foreign terrorist organization or that it engaged in terrorist activity or that it engages in terrorism.

Lastly, either the defendant or a coconspirator would have to -- we'd have to prove that a defendant or a coconspirator took at least one overt act in furtherance of said conspiracy.

Lastly, to satisfy the jurisdictional element, your Honor, the government would prove that the defendant was first brought or first landed in the United States in the Southern District of New York.

Count Two also charges a violation of 18 U.S.C. 371, namely, conspiring to receive military-type training from Alshabaab between January 2009 and November 2009.

The elements are similar but I'll go over them.

First, that the defendant agreed with one or more persons to receive military-type training.

Second, that the military-type training to be received was from a designated foreign terrorist organization, here,
Alshabaab again.

leaving Somalia.

Third, that the defendant knew that Alshabaab was an FTO or engaged in terrorism or terrorist activities.

And, lastly, that the defendant or a coconspirator took at least one overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

And, lastly, there's the jurisdictional element, as before, that the defendant was first brought into the United States into the Southern District of New York.

Were this case to go to trial, your Honor, the government would prove every element beyond a reasonable doubt through the defendant's confession or some part of it, law enforcement testimony, both of the FBI and abroad, wiretap intercepts, cooperating witnesses, photographic evidence, physical evidence recovered from the defendant, experts in explosives from the FBI. I think that would be it, your Honor.

THE COURT: And with regard to the overt acts?

MR. NAFTALIS: With regard to the overt acts, your

Honor, for example, with respect to he conspired to receive

material support, the government would prove, for example, by

the testimony of witnesses that the defendant in fact handed

over a loaded AK-47 to a commander of Alshabaab while he was

With respect to the training count, your Honor, the government would prove through telephonic intercepts and/or the defendant's admissions that he traveled to an Alshabaab guest house for the purpose of receiving military-type training from

1.6

1 | Alshabaab, among others.

THE COURT: Mr. Ahmed, please tell me in your own words what you did that leads you to believe that you are guilty of the crimes charged in Counts One and Two.

THE DEFENDANT: In the year of 2009, in Somalia, I agreed with others to give material support by donating 2,000 euro to an organization that I know that United States consider it to be a terrorist organization. This organization is called Alshabaab.

And in 2009, in Somalia, I asked other people and they agreed to allow me to join a training camp, military training camp, and I knew that United States considered that camp to be a camp belonging to a terrorist organization and that organization was known to me by United States that this organization is a terrorist organization. Again, this organization is called Alshabaab, and I went to the center of Alshabaab, which is close to Barawee, for that reason.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Shroff, is there any basis to challenge the government's proffer with regard to jurisdiction and venue, i.e., that the defendant was first brought to the United States in this district?

MS. SHROFF: I know of no facts with which to challenge that.

THE COURT: All right. Does the government agree there's a sufficient factual predicate for a plea of guilty to

1	Count One and Two of the superseding information?
2	MR. NAFTALIS: It does, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Shroff, do you agree that
4	there's a sufficient factual predicate?
5	MS. SHROFF: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Ms. Shroff, are you aware of any valid
7	defense that would likely prevail at trial or any other reason
8	why your client should be precluded from pleading guilty?
9	MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I have discussed each likely
10	defense with my client and explored them fully with him and
11	informed him and again discussed them thoroughly. With that
12	knowledge, Mr. Ahmed has decided to proceed and plead guilty.
13	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ahmed, do you have any
14	questions for me?
15	THE DEFENDANT: No, I have no questions, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: All right. With regard to Count One of
17	the superseding information S2 10 CR 131, how do you plead,
18	guilty or not guilty?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
20	THE COURT: With regard to Count Two of the
21	information, how do you plead, guilty or not guilty.
22	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
23	THE COURT: With regard to the forfeiture allegations
24	which are contained in the information in paragraphs 7 through
25	12, do you admit those allegations or do you deny those

1 | allegations?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't deny, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, when you don't deny, is that the same as admitting?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Based upon your responses to my questions and my observations, I find that you know your rights, you know the consequences of pleading guilty, and there's a factual basis for your plea of guilty.

Your plea of guilty and your admission to the forfeiture allegations are accepted.

I further find that the plea agreement was knowingly and voluntarily entered into.

I'm going to order a presentence investigation and report and direct that no interview of you take place unless Ms. Shroff or her representative or Mr. Maher are present.

It's important that you be candid, honest, truthful with the people who prepare the report. Tell them the good things about your life and the not so good things. The report will be important in my decision on sentencing.

Before the day of sentencing, you will have an opportunity to go over that report with an Arabic language interpreter. I urge you to do that. If there are any mistakes in the report, point them out through the interpreter to your lawyer so that your lawyer can point them out to me.

Mr. Naftalis?

THE DEFENDANT: 1 Yes. 2 THE COURT: Sentencing in this case is set for 3 November 2, 2012, at 11:30 a.m. Is there anything further from the government? 4 5 MR. NAFTALIS: A moment, if I can confer with 6 Ms. Shroff? 7. THE COURT: Yes. 8 (Pause) 9 MR. NAFTALIS: May I just add one thing to the record, 10 your Honor? 11 THE COURT: Yes, you may. MR. NAFTALIS: And I've talked to Ms. Shroff about 12 13 I just wanted to just state that under -- it applies to 14 prior credit of time already in custody being applied to the 15 term of imprisonment that may be imposed here, that by order of 16 statute 18 U.S.C. 3585, it is that a defendant may receive 17 credit for prior service of time if it relates to the same course of conduct, but that is a BOP determination. And I'm 18 19 just putting on the record that the statute exists and the BOP 20 makes that determination. 21 THE COURT: Not the Court. 22 MR. NAFTALIS: Not the Court or the government. . 23 THE COURT: Right. MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may I have a second with 24

1 |

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

MR. NAFTALIS: And I can represent, your Honor, that the government states that, in its opinion, the defendant, when he began -- when he was picked up in November '09 until he was flown to the United States was in custody for the same course of conduct as he is held here. While it's still BOP's determination, the government represents that is its take on the facts.

THE COURT: Right. There's no dispute that once post-indictment he was arrested by U.S. authorities and flown, that by operation of law, the Bureau of Prisons must give him credit for that time. Correct?

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor, after arrest.

THE COURT: So you are referring to the time when he was arrested in Kano, Nigeria, until the time that he was arrested by U.S. authorities in Nigeria, that there is no obligation to give him credit for time served, that's a BOP determination and out of the control of the Court and the government?

MR. NAFTALIS: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Shroff, do you understand that?

MS. SHROFF: No. I understand that since Mr. Ahmed was not serving any time from November 20, 2009 onward and was held in Abouja on no Nigerian charges whatsoever and, in fact,

that time should be credited to him towards this case and the government at sentence will take no contrary view when that argument is made by defense counsel. That is my understanding.

THE COURT: But the point that I understood

Mr. Naftalis to be making is that determination, that you're

free to urge that and indeed I think I heard the government say

and acknowledge that he was held on the same course of conduct.

But the authority who makes that determination is not the

government and it's not the Court. It's the Bureau of Prisons.

Do you dispute that? The Court can make a recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons.

MS. SHROFF: I don't dispute anything with the Court because, obviously, there are no agreements between the parties and the Court. I just want to be clear that my understanding is that the government's position will be at sentence that he should be credited with every day he spent in custody starting in November 20, 2009. That is their position to be communicated to the Bureau of Prisons.

THE COURT: But that last part is the important part for not only for you to understand but, more importantly, for your client to understand that when the government stands up and urges this or you urge it and they don't oppose it, those are merely words on the record. And, yes, the Court can recommend things to the Bureau of Prisons. But the important point that I want to make sure your client understands that for

1 that time period, that is a BOP determination, not a judicial 2 determination. 3 MS. SHROFF: That's correct, your Honor. And, of 4 course, Mr. Ahmed reserves and retains every application he 5 made, can possibly make in the event the Bureau of Prison gets 6 it wrong. That's fine. 7 THE COURT: I understand that as well. discussed this topic with your client, Mr. Ahmed? 8 9 MS. SHROFF: We have, your Honor. We in fact 10 discussed it, and I discussed it again with the government 11 which is what prompted them to inform the Court. THE COURT: All right. Anything further from the 12 government? 13 14 MR. NAFTALIS: No, your Honor. Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Anything further from the defense? 16 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may I have a second? 17 THE COURT: You may. 18 (Defendant and counsel conferring) 19 MS. SHROFF: Thank you, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: All right. And I simply want to commend 21 Mr. Naftalis, Ms. Strauber, who is not here today, you, 22 Ms. Shroff, and also Mr. Maher for the professional way in 23 which this case has been conducted from beginning to end; and I thank you all for your hard work. 24

We're adjourned.